



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,182	11/14/2003	John P. Christian	42P17670	9382
8791	7590	07/18/2007	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			YENKE, BRIAN P	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2622				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/18/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/714,182	CHRISTIAN, JOHN P.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRIAN P. YENKE	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment (14 May 07).

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. As stated previously:

The information disclosure statement filed 15 Apr 2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. As noted on the attached form 1449—the PCT International Preliminary Examination Report, PCT/US02/30954 was missing, thus not considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima et al., JP-6-169440 in view of Milne et al., US 2002/0180890 and Burns et al., US 6,630,964.

In considering claims 1, 15 and 24,

Tajima discloses a modular TV receiver which includes detachable modules/cards, which may be replaced including (Fig 1) a communication satellite tuner, a broadcasting satellite tuner, a MUSE-NTSC converter a teletext adaptor etc...

However, Tajima does not explicitly recite the conventional components which transmit/receive/process the data within the modular receiver, i.e. buses.

The examiner evidences such conventional practice as shown by Burns et al., US 6,630,964 (Fig 1), which discloses both a data bus 116 and address bus 117 to receive multiple types of modulated signals and provide them to their respective decoder/tuner for demodulation/decoding (meeting the claimed 1st and 2nd bus connectors since the buses receive/transmit/send all data within the components).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a connection between the components/cards/modules of Tajima by using conventional hardware/software such as the use of a bus to connect/interact the modules in order to receive/process and ultimately display the user desired data.

In considering claim 2,

As stated above with respect to claim 1, Tajima discloses the reception of communication satellite or broadcast satellite signals, wherein the signal are in the RF spectrum, thereby being received by RF bus.

In considering claims 3, 12, 13, 16 and 25,

Tajima discloses the tuning of signals from a communication or broadcast satellite which must be demodulated (i.e. converted to baseband) for display.

In considering claims 4, 11, 17,19 and 26,

The combination of Tajima/Burns discloses the transfer of data/command/control within the system/modules by the use of a buses. It is also known that other conventional command/control systems are known such as USB, as disclosed by applicant.

In considering claims 5 and 14, 18

Burns discloses the concept of a printed circuit board. Tajima discloses the concept of interchangeable modules. Wherein it is also common practice to provide a shorted high or low field for a

respective slot, in order for the system to ascertain the identity/status of such slot, thus the examiner takes "OFFICIAL NOTICE" regarding such.

In considering claim 6,

Neither Tajima/Burns disclose the conventional fingers at the end of a cartridge, however the use of such based upon the type of card/module used is notoriously well known in the art, and since applicants own specification recites the common knowledge/use of such is not patentable.

In considering claim 7,

The combination of Tajima/Burns does not disclose an encoder coupled between the tuner and to decode, however Burns discloses a single component for a particular transmission scheme to tune/demodulate and decode such signals, thus as evidenced by case law *In re Dulberg*, 289 F.2d 522, 523, 129 USPQ 348, 349 (CCPA 1961), the separation of parts is considering an obvious modification to one of ordinary skill in the art, thus meeting the claim as recited.

In considering claim 8,

Tajima discloses the concept of a unit/housing in their modular design.

In considering claims 9, 22, 23

Refer to claims 1 and 6 above.

In considering claim 10,

Tajima discloses the feature of replaceable, exchanging, upgrading modules/cards/slots within the system, wherein they would have a surface to be gripped and thus inserted and/or removed.

In considering claims 20 and 27,

Tajima/Burns discloses the reception of various signals and the splitting/parsing of such signals via multiple contacts/slots within the system. Although, the word splitter is not explicitly recited, the examiner takes 'OFFICIAL NOTICE" regarding such, wherein the term "Splitter" in the field of endeavor is common practice.

In considering claim 21,

The combination of Tajima/Burns disclose the reception of signals, , however they do not disclose the conventional antenna/cabling of such system (i.e. coax), wherein the use of such cabling with an

antenna in the reception/processing of audio/video signals is well known thus the examiner takes "OFFICIAL NOTICE" regarding as such, since it's a type of wire/cabling used to process such signals.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure—see newly cited references on attached form PTO-892.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Yenke whose telephone number is (571)272-7359. The examiner work schedule is Monday-Thursday, 0730-1830 hrs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, John W. Miller, can be reached at (571)272-7353.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(571)-273-8300

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703)305-HELP.

General information about patents, trademarks, products and services offered by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), and other related information is available by contacting the USPTO's General Information Services Division at:

800-PTO-9199 or 703-308-HELP

(FAX) 703-305-7786

(TDD) 703-305-7785

An automated message system is available 7 days a week, 24 hours a day providing informational responses to frequently asked questions and the ability to order certain documents. Customer service representatives are available to answer questions, send materials or connect customers with other offices of the USPTO from 8:30 a.m. - 8:00p.m. EST/EDT, Monday-Friday excluding federal holidays.

For other technical patent information needs, the Patent Assistance Center can be reached through customer service representatives at the above numbers, Monday through Friday (except federal holidays) from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST/EDT.

The Patent Electronic Business Center (EBC) allows USPTO customers to retrieve data, check the status of pending actions, and submit information and applications. The tools currently available in the Patent EBC are Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) and the Electronic Filing System (EFS).

PAIR (<http://pair.uspto.gov>) provides customers direct secure access to their own patent application status information, as well as to general patent information publicly available. EFS allows customers to electronically file patent application documents securely via the Internet. EFS is a system for submitting new utility patent applications and pre-grant publication submissions in electronic publication-ready form. EFS includes software to help customers prepare

submissions in extensible Markup Language (XML) format and to assemble the various parts of the application as an electronic submission package. EFS also allows the submission of Computer Readable Format (CRF) sequence listings for pending biotechnology patent applications, which were filed in paper form.



B.P.Y
11 July 2007



BRIAN P. YENKE
PRIMARY EXAMINER